Case 3:12-cr-0027 Fine MG S-DARWIDS TRACT COLOR 104/23/12 Page 1 of 1

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

| United States of America, | Case No. CR 12-0275 EMC |
|--|--|
| Plaintiff,) v.) | STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIME |
| Rajarshi Chaudhury | APR 2 3 2012 |
| Defendant.) | RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT |
| For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on April 23, 2012 to Mount of the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public 161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases the | , 2012 and finds that the ends of justice served c and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § |
| Failure to grant a continuance would be like See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i). | cely to result in a miscarriage of justice. |
| defendants, the nature of the prosec or law, that it is unreasonable to expect add | to [check applicable reasons] the number of ution, or the existence of novel questions of fact equate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii). |
| Failure to grant a continuance would deny taking into account the exercise of due dili | the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, gence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). |
| | asonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given nts, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. |
| Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). | |
| IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 4-23-17 | LAUREL BEELER United States Magistrate Judge |
| STIPULATED: | Andre Cagnet |
| Attorney for Defendant | Assistant United States Attorney |